

REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE FALLS CHURCH PLANNING COMMISSION
May 18, 2009
Council Chamber

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Lawrence called the meeting to order at 7:52 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Ms. Hockenberry
Mr. Lawrence
Ms. Rodgers
Ms. Teates
Mr. Wodiska

Member Absent: Mr. Kearney
Mr. Meeks

Administrative Staff Present: Ms. Cotellessa, General
Manager of Development
Services and Planning
Director
Ms. Perry, Senior
Planner

Chair Lawrence announced Mr. Meeks would not be present because was at a real estate convention in Las Vegas.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

Mr. Teates moved, and Ms. Hockenberry seconded, to adopt the agenda.

Upon voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

4. PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS:

Ms. Rodgers reported that the farmers market is now on summer schedule opening at 8 a.m. and there is a new ice cream vendor. She also reported that the ZOAC committee met last Wednesday and was meeting again next Thursday. They were isolating policy decisions that would have to be made by the City Council. They were still going through Section 2 but hadn't seen the changes to Section 1. She expected it would be a couple weeks before the Planning Commission would see anything.

Ms. Teates attended the school facility study meeting on April 28th and there was another one planned for May 27th. They looked at eight different schemes for school planning for the next 20 years. They ranged from tearing down the entire high school and building another all the way to where they do minor additions.

The main area to approach first is the elementary school where there were a lot of problems with classroom size. The high school would have to happen eventually because many things had to be done in the building. The next meeting they hopefully would finalize which scheme to put together in the report. She said it was important when the public process starts to present the public with a lot of different options and provide the good and bad features of those options.

They were trying to work within the scope of the land and see if other land might be available. They were very close to having a final report and then would begin the public process to receive input.

Ms. Teates also attended the EDA meeting this month. There was discussion about the presentation of the North Washington streetscape, South Washington transportation plan, and East Falls Church. She gave her impressions on what had been going on.

Ms. Hockenberry welcomed Mary Ellen Henderson 7th graders Truman and Preston Custer who were in the audience this evening working on citizenship.

Ms. Hockenberry noted this past Friday was the arts and cultural conference in Fredricksburg sponsored by Rappahannock Arts and Cultural. Ms. Hockenberry along with Ms. Cotellessa, Mr. Rick Goff from the EDA, Barbara Cram, Nikki Henderson attended. It was mainly an affirmation of what Falls Church was already doing and the direction they were going in. She proclaimed it to be a day well spent.

Mr. Wodiska reported on the 22nd of April he attended the CACT meeting and heard a presentation from Mr. Dippold's 7th grade class. Numerous students did a detailed analysis of the situation on Route 7 and Pennsylvania Avenue and the high level of traffic there. They presented the situation with various solutions but ultimately decided on, after detailed analysis and statistics, a brick crosswalk consistent with the layout and landscape of the area. At that meeting staff announced there was going to be some traffic lights put there to address that situation since that is a real problem with people crossing the street at that location. Mr. Wodiska pronounced it had been a wonderful presentation and the CACT appreciated the time the students put into their presentation.

Mr. Wodiska further announced there would be a traffic calming case on Wednesday, May 20th, for Lincoln Avenue which was just starting. It's usually a four or five month process.

Chair Lawrence asked what section of Lincoln Avenue that involved. Mr. Wodiska replied parts of Lincoln Avenue were in Arlington County which they didn't have jurisdiction over but it was Lincoln Avenue in Falls Church City, from where it intersects Great Falls. Ms. Hockenberry added people were speeding there and there was strong interest about this in the community.

5. RECEIPT OF PETITIONS: None.

6. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Ms. Cotellessa advised the commissioners last week there was an interesting presentation on the proposed Granicus System which is a live web streaming system similar to what the City of Fairfax and Alexandria have. It would be going in the next couple of weeks before the City Council for funding. She expected in a very short time the Planning Commission meetings would be streamed live on the web so wherever you are in the world, you'll be able to see it and they would be preserved for posterity. If you want to see what happened on a particular night, you can bring up the video on one side of the screen and the other side will be the actual agenda. You can click on any agenda item on the tape and the tape will immediately go to that point.

The Falls Church Housing Corporation submitted on the due date their application

MINUTES OF THE 18 MAY 2009 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

APPROVED 1 JUNE 2009

PAGE 2

for tax credits for the Center City South Apartment project revised. There was talk about some revisions that might be coming forward. It would need to come forward as a special exception amendment and then as a new site plan. Over the next six months or so that can be expected to be processed through.

It was submitted as two buildings, two projects: One senior and one affordable family. It was approximately the same ratio but less units and did not include the commercial office building that was added after the last Council meeting.

Ms. Cotellessa had not yet seen the final drawings but it was basically submitted for those tax credits with the understanding it would be coming back to the community for revisions.

Chair Lawrence inquired if an application like that was public or did the Planning Commission get the details after VHDA had looked at it and made a decision.

Ms. Cotellessa was sure parts of it were public. She thought they were due to do some initial crunching and have some ranking in the July time period and it should go fairly quickly. Her expectation was they would be working to bring the SE amendment forward and it should be started within the next three or four months.

Ms. Rodgers said she may have misunderstood the discussion at the last worksession but it sounded to her that they needed to do something more than an amendment and it would be a new special exception submittal.

Ms. Cotellessa said the process was exactly the same, whether it was an amendment or new submission. They still had to put in the application. They still had to do the drawings, still had to go through the justification. It still needed to be referred out to the other boards and committees.

Ms. Rodgers inquired if the higher fees would be in effect by then. Ms. Cotellessa thought they would be trying to get in before those. That should be coming before the commission fairly soon.

Ms. Cotellessa said they just went through the day long process of looking at the possibility of arts and cultural districts in Falls Church. She noted they were fortunate enough to have received a presentation from Virginia Tech Planning Studio group which did a presentation looking at the potential for an arts and cultural district as well as heritage district trails in the City. The students gave permission to show the presentation and she thought it might be a good jumping point to talk about arts and cultural districts in general. She'd like to bring that in on the 1st or the 15th of June as a special worksession. She thought what was interesting was the linkage between art and green. There had been talk about natural art: Stonework, landscape art, things that might fit nicely in combining those things.

Ms. Cotellessa thought in July both the EDA and the Planning Commission might be able to meet together for a joint worksession. Very often The EDA fed information to the commission on land use cases and were heavily involved in the impact assessment. Planning staff was going to training tomorrow on the impact model and how the impact is looked at. That would be brought forward in a worksession. Ms. Cotellessa noted that economic development really affected housing and maybe they ought to pull out a separate economic development section recognizing the importance of that to the community and she looked forward to doing that in the fall and getting EDA's help doing that.

Ms. Teates agreed that was a great idea because they're having a consultant look at the area near BJ's and she thought that was definitely something to be put in the Comp Plan. There were only certain places in Falls Church for commercial to be successful and that was a place where they might be successful because it's already here.

Ms. Cotellessa said Ms. Teates was referring to the fact that EDA hired a planning consultant, a successful local planner who was working on a project looking at what could be done starting with the area near BJ's but also with interest in other parts of the City. He's trying to pull in the Virginia Tech studio group in the master classes. She was very impressed with the group that did the last project. These were people who are working on master's in planning, but are already architects and planners and have new ideas and a fresh look. The consultant was going to try to pull that class in to the Planning Commission and hopefully would be brought before the commission in July.

Ms. Hockenberry thought the whole idea of the EDA bringing in the arts and cultural overlay concept was great because it's a huge economic driver and she thought the more and more they see that and the more they aim towards that, the better off the City would be. She also thought the presentation by the master's class group was really professional.

Ms. Rodgers asked about the building that was supposed to be a green building going up, the Monarch, and what had happened to that.

Ms. Cotellessa didn't know anything about it but for some reason that came up today and somebody from Monarch Development was speaking somewhere in the City, so they're still around. Ms. Rodgers noted the reason she brought it up is that she was at the Village Preservation Society meeting yesterday discussing green buildings and someone asked if there was a green building in Falls Church. She remembered that it was supposed to be going towards a platinum LEEDS but hadn't heard or seen anything.

Ms. Cotellessa said that Monarch Development was scheduled to speak to the EDA.

Regarding the Falls Church Housing application, Mr. Wodiska wanted to get Ms. Cotellessa's understanding of the role the Planning Commission had with the new application. If they already received a tax credit, it seemed the Planning Commission still needed to provide a review of it; however the flexibility they had in manipulating the site plan seemed to be highly limited. He was curious what her understanding was.

Ms. Cotellessa pronounced she was limited because she hadn't seen anything final. She was heartened by the fact they reduced the number of units to give more breathing space. They were doing structured parking, which would be helpful. Having gone through the process, they are aware of issues that they might not have thought was critical in the first round and she hoped they would be sensitive to that.

Mostly she was heartened by the fact they had a really good partner who would be the managing partner for the project who has built this before and knows how it works. It was designed to meet the tax credit requirements first. They have a new architect who had done these buildings and were aware of what the City's material needs were.

Her expectation was the process would be gone through exactly the same way as the

first time. City Council would send it to the Planning Commission, to EDA, to AAB for comment. The Planning Commission would then weigh in on the aspects of the project that concerned them the most, whether it be circulation, the way the building looked, or how it would function in that part of the City. It would then be the Planning Commission's job to send that to City Council and then they weigh it and they make the decision. Once that's done, it comes back to the Planning Commission for essentially an administrative act and hopefully not repeat the issue before. If there is a parking issue, it's identified in the early rounds before it gets back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Wodiska asked, for example, if there was a problem with parking similar to the last time and the Planning Commission said that needed to be altered because of whatever reason, because it's gone through the application, does the applicant then say, well, that's a really great suggestion but we can't accommodate that request because that ruins the whole tax credit concept.

Ms. Cotellessa said the project itself has probably been largely formed because it had to be laid out with all the per forma. They have said they thought they could do some tweaking. Heavy tweaking may cause a problem with the tax credits. But she thought everyone was trying to be sensitive to that and she thought their partners would be as responsive as they can be. They would just have to go through the project the best way they can.

Ms. Rodgers wanted to be clear that this involved an amendment to the special exception even though the project was lower in height and less units. She asked if the reason they're doing that was because it's still residential in a commercial district and they need a special exception for that and it needed a change to the Comp Plan, and were those the two areas special amendments would be needed?

Ms. Cotellessa noted there were two special exceptions granted in the original project. One was for height and other for residential in a mixed use. They would not need the height. The only SE that would be in play was the residential one.

Ms. Rodgers asked if even though the height would be within the by right process, they would still have to get the special exceptions for the residential or no retail in the business district.

Ms. Cotellessa acknowledged it was a mixed use building and office space would be put in but that was the SE that would be reheard.

Chair Lawrence had a question about Northgate. He heard there were questions in the City Council meeting last week about the condition of the site and Mr. Shields was to do a report on the condition and asked if Ms. Cotellessa had heard anything about it.

Ms. Cotellessa hadn't heard anything. They were talking about graffiti and poor grass and other issues and trash at the funeral home. She didn't know what the outcome was but would find out and let them know.

7. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Department of Development Services Fee Schedule Amendments Recommendation to the City Council

Ms. Perry reported on April 27, 2009, City Council gave first reading to a proposed ordinance that would revise the fee schedule for the Development Services Division

MINUTES OF THE 18 MAY 2009 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

APPROVED 1 JUNE 2009

PAGE 5

and at that time they also referred the proposed ordinance to the Planning Commission and the BZA for comments and recommendation.

The proposed fee schedule would update the fees to better reflect the current cost of reviewing and processing applications and other requests for information. Revised fee schedule better reflects the nature and variety of developments currently in the City and continues to see and it will require fees for applications, inspections, or other requests to Council and/or the Planning Commission that currently do not require one or where a fee is not currently specified in the fee schedule.

The fee schedule has not been comprehensively updated since 1997. The proposed fees are intended to capture costs incurred by the City in administering the application but they're also usual and customary fees charged by local governments in the land use and development process. Other fees charged by other jurisdictions currently were looked at in similar applications and the proposed fees were found to be comparable with those in the region.

The fees proposed have an effective date of July 1st which would be the first day of the new fiscal year. In summary, most of the existing fees will be increasing. There were a few new fees such as existing applications and services not currently captured in the fee schedule; where there is an application or request for information and a fee that is comparable to another application or request for information where they currently do not have one; again, where there is a service that is usual and customary with a local government and a fee is not currently being assessed.

There were also some changes in the fee schedule as a result of clarification to fees, some of which were being clarified to be more relevant to the changes in the development process.

Ms. Perry had received a few questions about the fee schedule which she wanted to address before entertaining any questions. A few were editorial. Where they referenced the fees associated with commercial bonds inspections and preservations, lines 288 and 290, all those fees were based on where the landscaping was greater than \$12,000. There was one error there in the greater and less than arrows.

There were some question about how one would define damage when there was damage to a public tree or the streetscape irrigation system. With regard to public trees, it could come from several incidents, some more severe than others, such as a car crashing into a tree. The fee recommended by the arborist was intended to try to capture the range of damage that might happen, whether it's complete destruction and taking it down and replacing it and helping the new tree to be successful and to thrive. Also where maybe they have damage to the tree that will reduce the life span of the tree and would require additional monitoring or some other remediation. It's not perhaps a dollar per dollar type assessment but trying to recapture some costs associated when there is damage to a public tree.

Similarly in streetscape irrigation, it's the City's responsibility to maintain the irrigation but there were lots of third party activities that could damage this and cause great cost to the city. The fee recommended was looking to capture the range, whether it's small scale damage or much greater damage to the streetscape irrigation. It's an average based on what staff has experienced in addressing this issue.

Regarding the tree issue, there was a metric left out when talking about how they

MINUTES OF THE 18 MAY 2009 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

APPROVED 1 JUNE 2009

PAGE 6

would be assessing the fee of damage to a public tree. It would be by inch of diameter at breast height, so the word "inch" needed to be included in the staff report.

There was a question about the fees associated with a waiver request and whether the fee would be levied whether or not the waiver was approved. The answer was yes, the fee was for the application for the waiver, recognizing the type of research and analysis that would have to be done associated with many of the waivers that were part of the site plan process.

There was an inquiry about block parties and shutting down streets in the City. That had come up in prior discussion on fee schedules. Ms. Perry wanted to mention that was a function that goes through the Department of Environmental Services who works in coordination with the police. It's part of their fee schedule and their review.

Ms. Perry offered to answer questions from the commissioners.

Chair Lawrence asked if this would be the place to inform the public to submit documents in a specific form so documents could be put on the web site.

Ms. Perry related one of the ways they were looking to do that was to make it part of the submission requirement. It would be inclusive in the current fees. The application would be additional. It would be included as part of the process of updating the applications in association with the updated fee schedule.

Chair Lawrence asked if there were any automatic exemptions, such as non-profit charities, or do you have to apply for a waiver and plead.

Ms. Perry replied currently there was no provision for that. Based on historical research on the fee schedule, there may be laws involved as to where the discretion was to waive or allow a waiver provision in the fee schedule. It needed to be ironed out with the City attorney.

Chair Lawrence inquired if there would be a maximum limit on damage to trees. Ms. Cotellessa replied there was not an upper limit attached right now. The cost to get a tree down and then replant it was far beyond the fees imposed and she didn't feel they were excessive at all.

Mr. Wodiska noted all the different fees were listed on a piecemeal basis. If you come in for an application for a new development, was there one set fee or was it always on a piecemeal basis.

Ms. Perry explained it's based on the development being proposed. It is common for an applicant or prospective developer to come in and talk with staff about the scope of their project, what they're looking to do, what they can do under the Code, and the application packet is discussed beforehand. Staff works with the applicant to identify the fees upfront.

Ms. Hockenberry recognized the City was revising all their fees in all different areas and others had gone to Council. She hoped fees would be looked at on a regular basis and more often than 13 years. She also thought the City needed to cover costs as much as possible.

Ms. Perry said one of the reasons the fee schedule was brought up this time was under Ms. Cotellessa's direction, the idea of reviewing the fee schedule was in

MINUTES OF THE 18 MAY 2009 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

APPROVED 1 JUNE 2009

PAGE 7

conjunction with the budget cycle and that was something commonly done. It helped staff keep an eye on the fees and ensure development. They were also looking to make the fee schedule user friendly. When someone comes in, staff is happy to work with the developer or potential applicant. They can walk through the fee schedule and identify what the fees may be without too many surprises. This is to help make the fees more inclusive rather than nickel and dime every part of the process, and to try to provide equitable fees so you know up front what you're going to be paying without additional fees for other parts of the process. That will help keep the fees updated but have them refined with the application process.

Chair Lawrence asked if a single family tree residential permit was per permit and not per tree and you could have multiple trees in there, which Ms. Perry acknowledged was correct.

Mr. Wodiska agreed with Ms. Hockenberry's comment and fully supported the Planning Department trying to cover their costs. He said it's very important a city the size of Falls Church takes these sort of steps.

He had one question related to the staff report. On line 77 it said, To capture the increases in costs that often occur as the size of the project increases, staff is imposing a condition of a per acre fee to add to the site plan, etc."

He was curious why it was per acre for development in Falls Church and not square feet, which he thought more reasonable. Ms. Perry said over time in trying to get comparables and figuring what would work best for the City and the new components of a fee, other jurisdictions did look at acre or a quarter acre type metric. That was something that was given thought to but perhaps as staff evaluates how it applies to different jurisdictions or perhaps the Planning Commission could make it part of the recommendation, it could be half acre or quarter acre increments.

Mr. Wodiska agreed with that because an acre seemed too large.
Ms. Hockenberry said that needed to go in the motion.

Ms. Perry noted several different places under site plan where a quarter acre was noted. That metric was added for also the rezoning component and the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use map change. She would make sure that was consistently at a quarter acre wherever referenced.

After a brief review, Ms. Perry remarked a quarter acre seemed to be the appropriate language.

Chair Lawrence submitted the fee needed to be changed wherever it said an acre. Ms. Perry said they would double check and make sure that the language was consistent, square feet versus quarter acre.

Ms. Teates submitted the modification could be the staff reassess the measurement being used to make sure it's consistent. Ms. Perry noted because this was a recommendation, staff could report on that. Ms. Teates thought the problem was in looking at consistency with other fee schedules, they may have been inconsistent in land measurement.

Ms. Perry said it would probably be a good idea to go back and check because in using another jurisdiction as a reference, it still needed to fit the City's fee schedule.

Ms. Teates really appreciated the fact that staff provided the schedule with the existing and proposed fees next to each other and thought it was a very good report.

MOTION: Ms. Hockenberry moved, and Mr. Wodiska seconded, that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the fee schedule as provided in the staff report with the following modifications of finding consistent measurement of land area of metric use throughout the report.

Chair Lawrence asked if the item needed to be opened to the public. Ms. Cotellessa responded that it's not a zoning text amendment but it's been formally referred to the Planning Commission. It also was advertised for a public hearing. It's an ordinance because that was what had been required by state code. The City's zoning ordinance requires it come to the Planning Commission through resolution which was not consistent with state code. They were going forward as an ordinance and therefore it was being heard at public hearing and should be opened to the public.

The Chair opened the item to the public. Hearing no response, the Chair closed the item to the public.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

B. Disposition of Land: Authorizing the City Manager to Advertise the Sale of Real Property at 215 South Lee Street.

Howard Herman, General Manager of Community Services, was present to seek the recommendation of the Planning Commission regarding advertising the sale of 215 South Lee Street.

Mr. Herman reported two weeks ago there was a worksession on this item with the Planning Commission and City Council. 215 South Lee Street was property the City purchased in 2007. Initially the City approached the owners of that property hoping to buy a portion of the lot to allow for the completion of the trail that will run from West Broad Street down to Tripps Run and the bike trail that runs along Tripps Run. The City also sought an easement or sought land that would provide access to the park from Lee Street.

In the course of the negotiations with the homeowner, the City was unable to convince the homeowner to sell a portion of the property. It was either buy the house and the land or no deal. They moved forward, it went to the Planning Commission for a recommendation. The Planning Commission recommended the purchase of the property and City Council approved that purchase. The property was purchased and for the last year the City has been working with the firm Patton Harris Rust and Associates to look at ways to design and develop the park.

In the course of doing that, the City looked hard at 215 South Lee Street and really researched and looked at ways to gain access off of Lee Street and complete the trail from Broad Street down to Tripps Run. In doing so, it became evident that the house could be saved and be still left with a conforming lot. The City has moved forward to do a boundary line adjustment, create an easement that will provide access to the park from Lee Street, and also have recommended that the proceeds from this sale go back to open space acquisitions that would help acquire

MINUTES OF THE 18 MAY 2009 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

APPROVED 1 JUNE 2009

PAGE 9

additional open space for another park or another area when the City has a need.

From a staff perspective, Mr. Herman looked at this as a win-win. The City would gain everything that it wanted when the property was initially purchased; it would be put back on the tax roles, they would collect taxes from a property that currently no taxes were collected from, getting what the City wanted out of the site; and also having additional funds available in the open space acquisition fund to potentially purchase other open space if the City should desire to purchase.

Mr. Herman offered to answer questions by the commissioners.

Mr. Wodiska agreed that this was a win-win. He thought it was fantastic that the City could sell the house but also put it back on the tax dole and was strongly supportive of it.

He knew there was one interested party in terms of the sale of the house, but wondered if this was going for sale in the general market.

Mr. Herman acknowledged in a few days a sign would be put up and the house would be advertised for sale and they would be seeking other offers for the house. There was currently one offer on the house.

Ms. Rodgers wondered if there was the possibility of when the house came up for resale again, if the City could have the right of first refusal in case the property could be used again for park land.

Mr. Herman replied there's been no discussions regarding that but that could be something to throw into the mix.

Ms. Rodgers noted when the property was first obtained, there was discussion at the Recs and Parks meeting about parking lots and different ways of using the property. The neighbors were not happy about some of the ways discussed. Things do change and reasons for using property changes and she thought it might be an opportunity, particularly because it is connected to a park, to think about that.

Mr. Herman said it was certainly something that could be looked into and discussed with the potential purchaser.

Ms. Hockenberry wanted to say this was a good example of thinking forward on things, getting a piece of property that the City really needed to link everything up. She thought the City needed to be very vigilant in looking for different properties that would afford expansion that the City needed at different sites. She knew it was tough with the CIP but she thought this was a real opportunity. She thought the right of first refusal in terms of future planning was a very good idea.

Chair Lawrence noted Mr. Meeks couldn't be here because of business and he had raised concerns at the worksession. Mr. Herman worked with Mr. Meeks and when Chair Lawrence asked Mr. Meeks if there was anything he wanted him to say, he said, No, I talked with Howard, I'm good. Mr. Meeks' main concern was making sure the money went back in open space acquisition and it was done wonderfully.

Ms. Teates wanted to comment that she was glad to see the use of the property. She was concerned because originally they were talking about a nature center or some type of park with a more formal entrance to this park. The two current entrances that were public were very hard to find. She was very concerned about that.

MINUTES OF THE 18 MAY 2009 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

APPROVED 1 JUNE 2009

PAGE 10

There was a comment made at the worksession that it didn't matter because there were plenty of parks that didn't have parking. She had to think those parks would be used more if people knew they could go back there.

She wanted to mention that she was disappointed because she liked the idea there would be a formal entrance, maybe some parking, and maybe a little nature center. That was something lacking in any of the City's parks. She recognized this was a good situation and there would be another entrance to the park and the money would be turned over to open space acquisition.

Mr. Herman responded that he would be coming back before the commission probably in the fall with a site plan for Hamlett Park and he was real happy how that was moving forward, with new access points and with greater visibility off of Broad Street and the school site.

The Chair opened the item to the public. Hearing no response, the Chair closed the item to the public.

MOTION: Ms. Rodgers moved, and Ms. Teates seconded, that the Planning Commission approve the sale of a portion of the land owned by the City at 215 South Lee Street subject to the following:

1. That the lot shall be divided in two portions, one approximately 13,500 square feet containing the existing home, and one retained by the City, approximately 4,700 square feet, that will be used to complete a pedestrian bike trail through Hamlett Park;
2. Installation of an easement on the lot to be sold to allow for access to the park from Lee Street.
3. Proceeds from the sale will be used to fund future open space acquisition.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

9. **OTHER BUSINESS:**

Ms. Cotellessa announced a town hall meeting is scheduled June 11th, 2009, to discuss the North Washington Streetscape project. There were mixed messages that came out at both the Commission and Council level about the direction it was going and the various features in it.

Some of the issues identified were sidewalk width and composition, street furnishings including lighting, and treatment of some of the gateways and focal points along North Washington Street.

Three tables were suggested to be set up staffed by Planning Commission members and City staff. Chair Lawrence, who would not be able to attend because he would be out of the country, encouraged the commission members to notify Ms. Cotellessa what areas would be of particular interest to them.

10. **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL:** 20 April 2009

Chair Lawrence inquired about the letter put in the record regarding Mr. Kearney

not being present regarding BJ's. Ms. Cotellessa said they would attach it to the minutes in the official minute files.

Ms. Rodgers moved, and Ms. Teates seconded, to approve the minutes of 20 April 2009 as amended.

Upon voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

11. ADJOURNMENT:

Ms. Rodgers moved, and Ms. Hockenberry seconded, a motion to adjourn at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Noted and Approved:

Ann Hieber
Recording Secretary

Suzanne Cotellessa, AICP
Planning Director

The City of Falls Church is committed to the letter and to the spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act. This document will be made available in an alternate format upon request. Call 703.248.5040 (TTY 711).